

## ABAG Regional Planning Committee Infrastructure Subcommittee Meeting #3

Bay Area Metro Center, San Francisco

October 12, 2016 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

### Participants

Mike Ambrose, East Bay Municipal Utility District

Chris Barkley, AECOM

Mark Boucher, Contra Costa Flood Control & Water Conservation District

Joshua Gale, SFPUC

Diane Gaines, Zone 7 Water Agency (phone)

Tracy Hemmeter, Santa Clara Valley Water District

Supervisor Karen Mitchoff, Contra Costa County

Jacob Reed, Alameda County Water District

Weston Starbird, City of San Jose (phone)

Michael Tognolini, East Bay Municipal Utility District

Sara Whatley, Zone 7 Water Agency (phone)

Dyan Whyte, SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Lori Wyatt, Sonoma County Water Agency

Edgar Castor, DHS - IP

Wynne Kwan, DHS – IP

Corey Reynolds, UASI

Duane Bay, ABAG

Arrietta Chakos, ABAG

Michael Germeraad, ABAG

Darcie Luce, ABAG

Natasha Dunn, ABAG

### Common Themes and Feedback

- Data collection and sharing needs to be done with purpose and in a way that meets confidentiality needs.
- Need to determine how members chosen and who makes up the Council and working groups (i.e. what level of expertise do they have, are they GMs, elected officials, etc.)
- How to best represent the complex governance structures for demographic coverage (i.e. which slots are for cities that provide their own water, public utilities with elected officials that act as 'local governments', utilities that provide some combination of water/wastewater/flood services, private utilities, groups of utilities, etc.)
- Need diversity of representation in size, geography, etc.
- Make sure to clearly state this is not in place of emergency management systems or post-event, but is instead a planning process that should inform mitigation decisions and pre-planning efforts by local and state emergency management systems. The process should leverage the body of work generated by emergency management community.

- Need to clearly state how other initiatives fit in (state, regional, federal).
- How to disseminate the information to those who need it (such as emergency responders).
- Water supply planning / land use planning is not reflected in the language.
- Debate as to which sectors should be included to start (natural gas, electricity, fuels, communications).
- Wording for the Council description needs tightening in many places.

## Meeting Minutes *(yellow highlights indicate recommendations)*

**Supervisor Michoff (Contra Costa):** Welcome. Public comment opportunity, seeing none let's move forward. We can skip intros since everyone's been part of the process thus far. Please everyone jump in with questions today. Duane, can you provide a process update?

**Duane Bay (ABAG):** Update on progress thus far and first two meeting topics. Purpose of meeting three is to simulate what a regional body would look like. Appropriated elements from San Francisco's lifelines council, but better than a utility service round table. Not looking to have a meeting connected to facts on the ground like water after an earthquake. This meeting's focus is on if we need a Lifelines Council and what it would look like. All the other meetings have led to this.

**Supervisor Mitchoff:** Housekeeping items on commenting. Before the discussion, we want to present on two existing lifelines council, Michael Germeraad from ABAG.

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** I'll present, and then Chris Barkley from AECOM, who was one of the co-chairs of the SF Lifelines Council, can speak to the SF example. San Francisco's Lifelines Council, first convened in 2009 and included lifeline utilities within SF such as communication, BART, SFPUC, Verizon, PG&E (electric and gas), AT&T and others. It was born out of a SPUR report authored by Chris Barkley in 2009. One of big deliverables was a 3 year process to produce an interdependency report to develop a standard recovery time frame after a scenario earthquake. The study went through a process of discovery and an interdependency matrix of fuel, water, transportation and the impacts for a scenario earthquake. Published in 2014, executive summary has a 5 year timeline with very specific tasks. Established priority routes for critical infrastructure, debris clearing, what corridors need prioritization to get systems up and running quickly post-event. If there are 100 trucks, where do they all go given that PG&E and CalTrans might need those areas too? Other ongoing studies as well – Port of San Francisco seawall study. City wanted to look at how many utilities interact with the seawall, and how the city's systems interact with their own infrastructure. One discreet task led by EM and PG&E was a tabletop to discover more interdependencies. This was an example of San Francisco coming together and forming a lifelines council and used it to share information and to move specific actions together, such as post disaster fuel recovery and priority routes. SF is one model of how we can think of a LLC to benefit other cities in the region. Before going into Charleston, Chris or Arrietta, comments?

**Chris Barkley (AECOM):** The original concept included what are the desired time frames for getting systems up and running, for example after an earthquake, what is the timeframe for 50% of water restored, 75%, 90%? What are the expectations? We looked at in the SPUR report, what should it look like, and took this to the lifelines council – the Interdependency Study, Tabletop, Quarterly meetings. Where do things stand and what is

currently underway. For San Francisco the next step was what's next? How do we achieve action? First, are these goals we want to achieve, what does the political leadership expect? How quickly do they expect the water to be back on? As a resident, I expect it to be on immediately. What's the gap between that and reality? One thing that didn't get mentioned is the regional piece. Arrietta will talk about this. How do we do this on a regional level? Water systems are really regional systems, even if SF owns a specific asset, but most of the stakeholders are public and private entities, they're very regional.

**Arrietta Chakos (ABAG):** In 2015 Chris and the others and I met for 12 months, on a deadline from the city. Quickly realized we had a mission that exceeded the group we were working with. We had many departments but what we realized was we had to take that work to a different level. The work that grew here at ABAG, and with DHS support, informed this subcommittee to broaden the work to explore the work that grew out of that and what's going on regionally.

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** Worked with DHS for out-of-region examples, regional or local. Best external model: Charleston Resilience Network (CRN), formed after flooding hit Charleston. Regional effort between state, local, regional council of governments, and non-profits, specifically to address water issues such as flooding.

**Supervisor Mitchoff:** I'm hearing you say they developed this after a big storm. Introduced Wynne from the Department of Homeland Security. Too soon to know, but are there any preliminary reports as to whether that was effective during this current hurricane?

**Wynne Kwan (DHS-IP):** There are some reports but we don't yet know how the work from CRN did with Hurricane Matthew. I know South and North Carolina were hard hit. We have assessment teams out now, recovery-wise, we'll hear more in two weeks. Florida and Georgia did not get hit as badly.

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** DHS connected us to CRN; we were planning on connecting pre-storm, but we'll give them some time. Their network covers a lot of what we're proposing. Our process shares common ground, common goals among jurisdictions and utility partners, where two partners are better than individual efforts. They have very specific flood focus. Big piece is opportunity to build partnerships. Mayor Techel (Napa) in the first meeting shared the importance relationships. CRN realized that was important, and it'll be interesting to hear what their experience has been.

**Edgar Castor (DHS-IP):** One thing that did come out this time, was significantly more accurate and timely reporting on the status of infrastructure. Infrastructure of concern and infrastructure asset list, priority levels 1, 2 and 3. After an incident, getting reporting so we know what's important to them, not just what is important to DHS and what the status is. That went more smoothly because of the work they've done. Part of that is also because of their regionalization efforts. We were getting regular updates even out here, with their prioritized assets, where they were, if they were operational, if they had limiting factors, what the online status was. After incident reporting is really important.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** This is good to know. Seems from a lay perspective, quick response of status informs what the response will be. May be more talk about this at the November meeting. Duane.

**Duane Bay (ABAG):** I'm going to put Michael back on. What we're trying for today is a prototype for November 10<sup>th</sup>. This is our best shot at a Regional Lifeline Council prototype. These seem to be the structural elements: Do we have a clear mission; are there some guiding principles that are different from the mission? Calling out that it needs to reference current initiative. Certain problems require regional scale. Any good design exercise has to have objectives against which you measure your prototype. We took a stab at that. Other factors, context, for example: ABAG is convening this and is bootstrapping this, but it's easy for us to say it should be here, it's just another element of the prototype. Similarly, we bring resilience perspective that we bring to all our work. We want to end up with a structured proposal, who would be there, time commitment, what would relationship be between overarching body and the working groups. Also some political discussion – who needs to be at the table. Please give feedback, permission to speak freely. If 80% looks solid sure but what about the vexing 20%. Inviting serious critique of what we're working on.

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** Reiterate if there had been an extra bold for prototype we would have added it. We want you to help frame this. There's the Nov 10<sup>th</sup> event, then the RPC for city feedback, then executive board for the entirety of the cities and counties. Today it would be great to get the utility perspective. Mission and guiding principles recognize there's already a number of programmatic resilient initiatives in the region, many utilities are recognized nationally. Want to recognize variety of roles and responsibilities that make it difficult for individual institutions to address challenges by themselves. Want space for utilities / cities to come together to find synergy and shared goal. How is regional lifelines council different than the SF lifelines council? ABAG has council of governments, planning staff, and these strengths can be leveraged to engage with utilities. This is borne of a need to address acute and chronic stresses in region. SF's effort may have been more focused than this, looking at acute shocks, but through their seawall project has been looking at sea level rise. By scaling up, bringing all utilities and cities in the region may be overwhelming. We looked at a subset of water, wastewater, flood protection and electricity as a place to start. Lots of work around energy codes and upgrades. We have the barcode again with cities and their interactions with their water and wastewater districts. We focused in 2016 on water and maybe as well in the near term next year. Structure is physical but also frequency. We don't want to exhaust anyone or have the process be "bootstrapped" solely by ABAG. Need to connect with other initiatives. Interesting to how to engage BARR into this and share their reports with this body to make it to city and county jurisdictions. We know there is a complementary initiative launching this Friday by DHS. Curious how we could insert the other non-ABAG initiatives into this process. Welcome folks to share comments.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Any changes or edits to existing principles or objectives? I assume we didn't reinvent the wheel and took from other plans.

**Mark Boucher (CC Flood Dist):** On Objective 1 [Leverage expertise and skill sets of Council members]. Would all council members be experts in the field? For example, elected officials are experts in policy? Is that the right kind of work we want?

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** We know everything!

**Duane Bay (ABAG):** Do you mean agencies versus individuals?

**Mark Boucher (CC Flood Dist):** Are individuals experts in their field? The seating chart had local government, maybe just some clarification.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** The expertise is in the technical staff, and skill set is also in the technical staff, used by whichever elected would be moving policy forward that the lifelines council recommends.

**Arrietta Chakos (ABAG):** I agree. One of the things on the national level is whether it's the Charleston Resilience Network or work in the DC area, is that these are primarily composed of experts and people working in operations and working with emergency responders. I think we leverage expertise and authority of senior elected officials. One hope is to look at common operating picture, common vulnerabilities, and then take it to another level. We don't just say we've got a great report, we've got our UWMP, it's all good. Need to look regionally at what we're missing, gaps, and how we begin to use the county and local levels and take lessons learned and do something.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** How about leverage technical and/or policy expertise?

**Wynne Kwan (DHS):** Leverage technical expertise and policy or political backing, political authority.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Fine with me, I'll leave it to the group. Want to not take away skill sets technical people have. I'd like to see this be more technical focused. Recommendation is we have electeds from each of the 3 largest cities, San Jose, San Francisco, Oakland, and county supervisors from all the others. That's six people. Technical side will be more. Not concerned about technical side outnumbering electeds because electeds will look to the technical people. I would never dare to think I know more about flooding than Mark in my county, if he's telling me "X", that's the policy I'm going to go with. I think I'm the only elected in the room, and I don't think we'll get our feelings hurt.

**Duane Bay (ABAG):** For Objective 1 rewording, how about, Leverage technical and political expertise and skills sets of staff of council members and their agency staff.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Do we have consensus on that statement, does that work? Ok.

**Chris Barkley (AECOM):** This may be an additional objective. What happens during events, situational awareness, response, assessment, recovery, then all the measures to strengthen the systems. But particularly during events, where this collaboration is crucial, the State has emergency management system, all counties have EOCs and a lot of these folks have representatives in the EOCs. Some work like UASI, trying to link through regional coordination. We need to be careful not to set up something parallel. Whatever this council ends up doing, in an event, actions are going to be taken are going to be taken in the context of the existing system. So somehow there's some additional objective of enhancing the ability of lifelines to collaborate in the context of the State's emergency management system (SEMS). Don't want to give the impression that you're setting up something completely divorced from that.

**Dyan Whyte (Water Board):** Just along the lines of where I was going to go. As a state agency it's been me at incident command dealing with emergency situations. The link between these two is pretty critical. So I've been at incident command where suddenly they needed to know where all the water intakes were in the Bay during an oil spill, and we were scrambling. **This link needs to be clear to many of the incident command people. I see this as more planning and preparation but if this link isn't made crystal clear, then it's not going to be nearly as beneficial.**

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Maybe strengthening Objective #4? And I get it, you're the experts.

**Dyan Whyte (Water Board):** Almost the recognition from OES and the role they play is key. They're the ones who notify folks who need to be involved in an emergency response and get them to where they need to be. Need to make sure whoever is going to that location knows this wealth of information exists and how to rely upon it, whether it's in an electronic format or not. Logistics of what would happen, if the right people weren't there that are here. **What's the triggering mechanism for implementation of this wealth of information?**

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Looking at mission [Strengthen collaboration among local governments and public and private infrastructure utilities]. **Should we change to Strong collaboration on federal, state, local, all levels of government?** That all gets fleshed out when the group starts meetings.

**Dyan Whyte (Water Board):** And first responders. There's also these EM response exercises that OES organizes, so having this information worked in starts to have this information embedded in people's minds so they know where to go to get background information.

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** Great comments that are not reflected in this process, we've been struggling on wording here. We did try to connect a little bit with the Yellow Command exercise this year that was a table top and a true exercise of commodity points of distribution. **Whether an objective or a mission, we need to state how this relates to emergency management and other initiatives that relate for coordination. Also stating this group is a different side of the process – coordination ahead of time on mitigation and preparedness.**

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** What I hear is we're taking in information and this is going to the RPC and then ABAG. We're just taking information in today? Is this group meeting after November 10<sup>th</sup>, so that we can tighten this and formalize it as a recommendation to RPC?

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** Don't have a meeting after the November 10<sup>th</sup> event, but we're happy to bring folks together. We were going to discuss later today how to formalize a polished council. We can discuss now, but if we come back to that at the end on how to move forward. Take feedback today, 2<sup>nd</sup> draft, share it, take written comments.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Lots of comments waiting. May be after staff puts this together, think about whether it's easier for a meeting or written comments. Maybe the latter as we get into the holiday season.

**Tracy Hemmeter (SCVWD):** Want to reiterate importance of being clear on how this is different from EM. There are important linkages and it's important to describe those, but to a layperson: they need to understand this isn't EM when an event occurs.

**Lori Wyatt (SCWA):** Concur with some of the other comments on showing the linkage. Objective 4 [*Foster the sharing of information and risk assessments*] could be stronger. Foster isn't a strong word, I'm not a fan of it, need something stronger.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Share?

**Lori Wyatt (SCWA):** Opportunity to expand from preparedness perspective, which is a lot of what we're talking about. The product or information that is shared during response for response and recovery, if you reflect on your resilience context, you reference risks that will impede recovery, if you tie the response to the recovery and how this will be used to help inform decision making during response and recovery, this might help make the linkage. That seems to be the strongest place to get that incorporated.

**Mark Boucher (CC Flood Dist):** OES puts together emergency management plans when there's not an emergency going on, and they always have a lot of these plans. In Contra Costa County, they have one for the Delta levees, others for the refineries. They're always working on them. If we don't bring them in early and at least give them a taste of what's going on, and we come back to them later, we can either duplicate or miss the mark. They're the experts in emergency response, they could say we've been working on a water supply plan, or we've been wanting to. SF is unique, it's all in one box. In Contra Costa County, we are separated by mountain ranges, so it's a little more difficult. We have at least 2 major water distributors, couple sewer districts. So at least bringing in OES and letting them be part of the discussion.

**Jacob Reed (ACWA):** SEMS is going to come into play. Coastal region is out of Walnut Creek - Jodi Traversero should be here, she's the lead there. There are gaps, but we can ID them together. Definitely CalOES and FEMA will be involved in response. In regard to elected officials, through SEMS, we are considered both a utility and a local government body since we have five elected officials.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Good to know. This body or the RPC wouldn't designate who the electeds would be, those would be done locally. We may want to expand to include special districts

**Mike Ambrose (EBMUD):** What about what's not in the language? It's not going to be used for response or disaster recovery. Also, lots of other FEMA, DHS, UASI initiatives and funding efforts. Can we put coordination as an objective?

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Good point about coordinating with DHS, OES, they all have similar components but different government structures.

**Edgar Castor (DHS-IP):** Get afraid talking about sharing risk assessments. Information we do is protected under PCII [Protected Critical Infrastructure Program from DHS] and not releasable except to trained entities or those like CalOES, etc. In deference to utility partners, have to define what they're going to ask them to release,

**proprietary information.** Attended an EBMUD workshop this summer on water and we spend a day talking about how to protect information and what you're comfortable sharing.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** **Need appropriate language here on non-confidentiality.**

**Arrietta Chakos (ABAG):** Like Edgar's point. Need safe data environment. Also use the intelligence that comes out of that, we don't need to know proprietary information. I'll pick on EBMUD. Don't need to know specifics on water breaks, just need to know it will be 30 days without water. Need to have planning parameters for cities.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** **Should this move forward by ABAG there will need to be operating standards, rules for how it will all work. Need broad language, but tight.**

**Wynne Kwan (DHS):** There are ways in which proprietary information can be used to inform decision making without telling us. In our office we have cyber resilient expert position that uses information from intelligence community without divulging it to find solutions to help communities identify for their cyber systems. Don't know exact protocols but DHS can assist with moving that forward.

**Chris Barkley (AECOM):** Seems to continue to come back to data. Don't know if council needs to collect data, we need reasons. What does the data support? What actions are you taking? Point of discussion of what are the requirements. From planning and resilience or response and recovery perspective, what data sets does everyone need, what are the mechanisms? **Instead of collecting data, setting up procedures for data sharing rather than the council doing it.**

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** You're right, we don't just want a library of risk assessments or data. The proposed working groups would have very tight scopes written for them. We'll need to be specific with information request to figure out if the utility has an assessment, and can they share key information to a lifelines council and bring in policy to move forward. Also, OES may have info we don't have, so may others. We have an application in for the Regional Resilience Assessment Program that could be a resource similar to SF's interdependence study and the five year plan highlighting a few key things the city could work on. If the opportunity comes through, it could provide this group with document that aggregates what we have, what we can share, and synthesizes for use by decision makers. This could offer The Lifelines Council insight into what exists today and where we need to move forward.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Everyone comfortable? On to context. Is the focus of resilience sufficient?

**Tracy Hemmeter (SCVWD):** First session focused on drought and water supply planning and the nexus of land use planning – I don't see that reflected here. There's discussion on it being chronic and acute but the chronic part, **the drought and land use planning piece not reflected in here. Maybe under resilience section add another paragraph.**

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Ok, anything else?

**Mark Boucher (Contra Costa Flood Dist):** With talk of OES, maybe this could go in the context, given that we're surrounded by all these other emergency management initiatives. EBMUD has some emergency plans.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Anything that needs additional language or additional bullets?

**Duane Bay (ABAG):** Last 2 sentences of Lifelines Council systems. Trying to get topical breadth but not too narrow. We can go into detail about why we chose water/wastewater/flood/electricity. Good arguments can be made for narrowing those or including others. This was arbitrary but we gave it our best shot.

**Mark Boucher (Contra Costa Flood Dist):** Seems like gas would fit in, especially in light of San Bruno.

**Duane Bay (ABAG):** Electricity got put in because water systems can't be run without electricity pumping and sending. Then fuel is needed, but then transportation comes in. We were trying to decide where to snip it. A lot of these infrastructure concerns are related to water, but many are not. Electricity was hard to pull apart.

**Mike Ambrose (EBMUD):** I would add natural gas because most of us have PG&E, and if you have them, you can talk gas and electric.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** It's a big chunk, again the lifelines council can talk about that.

**Darcy Luce (ABAG):** Making it water/wastewater as the focus, then tie gas and electricity as a subset so you're not taking the whole pie.

**Edgar Castor (DHS-IP):** Would take the "in the future, other infrastructure systems", not waiting on interest to develop. Need to be driving this train. And instead of 'could' add 'should'. I know I'm here representing the federal perspective, but get rid of the Federal priorities, the feds are here to support you. The feds have their own priorities. The Feds need to understand what regional and local priorities are. From DC, they think they have a good sight picture, but what you have to deal with at the local level is different than what they see. And just offer opportunity for interdependence, research and so on. Communications is key here. So many systems here rely on communications, just like energy. Your water isn't going to run without energy.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** With Edgar's suggestion, in the future there are communications, transportation, fuel, does that include natural gas?

**Chris Barkley (AECOM):** I see these as separate these. PG&E is pretty much natural gas. Fuels is a complex of companies.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** So the sentence Duane referenced would be 'these systems....electricity and natural gas'?

**Tracy Hemmeter (SCVWD):** Agree with comment focusing on water/wastewater/flood, and how other sectors are related and adding other things later. Water, wastewater, flood protection is all water. Electricity is part of everything. I like the idea of focusing on water and how other things relate.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** I hear electricity needs to be a part of this, it's what pumps the water.

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** In some ways each sector is related to all the others. Wanted to have some focus while it's still early stages and later could expand to bring in multiple infrastructure providers. Number of challenges connecting cities and counties with individual utility providers. Water is a good place to start. Lots of interactions on water delivery and wastewater collection so there may be early partnerships there. Flood control adds a unique layer because some water supply special districts do this work as well. Electricity was chosen as the best single opportunity for growth. We can clean up the language per Edgar. But if we bring into it all utilities, we don't want this to be spread too thin. It can grow and include other utilities.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** When this goes to ABAG electeds, I think natural gas will be part of discussion, I come from a county where there are lots of pipelines in the region. Can leave it out now, but we'll eventually have that discussion. I hear most people here think gas needs to be included. Especially because of San Bruno and because this is an earthquake prone region.

**Lori Wyatt (SCWA):** Changing it to 'power' could give it wiggle room, otherwise have to break out all the different types of power and the absence of one will bring up lots of questions. Can focus on moving forward now without committing.

**Mark Boucher (Contra Costa Flood Dist):** Wife works at PG&E and it seems like distribution is totally separate group than transmission. Transmission is the big thing – gas or electric. Energy services, related energy services instead of electricity might get into the power.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Is power an okay word for everybody?

**Mike Ambrose (EBMUD):** Power to me is electricity. Do you mean natural gas and electricity together?

**Mark Boucher (Contra Costa Flood Dist):** That's what I meant by energy services. In PG&E, energy services is gas and electric.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Let's leave it there. So a sentence in for adding natural gas and leave it to the RPC?

**Duane Bay (ABAG):** Need to underscore especially in context areas where there's an intersection of local government and utilities. We'll make it more clear.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** You have San Francisco, a city and county, and the San Jose person from Santa Clara. San Mateo's in the middle and they're going to put a supervisor on that board, and that person will want natural gas.

**Edgar Castor (DHS):** If we go back to the 17 critical infrastructure sectors, then energy is the right choice, because electricity and natural gas are part of that. Don't mean to cloud the issue.

**Duane Bay (ABAG):** In the list of 17 energy is one of them? Welcome to Edgar's world.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Thank you, want to keep us on track. To Jacob's point, special districts have equal concerns, jurisdictions, responsibility. **May need to look at an elected from each type of special district – water, wastewater, flood, although maybe a flood district gets 2.**

**Duane Bay (ABAG):** Here's our shot of a graphic that captures it.

*[Graphic of Draft Regional Lifelines Council Prototype]*

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Just thinking ahead, I know this will be a huge discussion at RPC, who these elected slots should be.

**Jacob Reed (ACWD):** Just brought it up for clarification because people forget that.

**Duane Bay (ABAG):** People wouldn't necessarily be thinking of elected from special utility districts, they'd be thinking private utilities.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** **I think local government, just call it electeds. The other side is public or private utilities.**

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** Two things, entity reflected and level of engagement (senior staff, elected). Tried to show a local government, we could specify a city. In the description we specify elected or senior staff. Would be interesting to get from utilities: would they be interested in having one of their electeds on a lifelines council vs. a GM? What level of stakeholders to bring. Idea is someone with technical expertise. Briefly, the graphic displays the complexity of jurisdictions and their roles, for example, Hayward is a city but provides water services; Santa Clara Valley Water District is not just water supply but flood protection; Zone 7 is similar. Wanted diversity but putting in natural gas wouldn't be hard to insert.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Again, knowing my colleagues, they'll want to discuss the elected piece, about representatives on a water board, versus a city like Hayward that does its own provision of water as part of the city government.

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** For Hayward, their municipal water system is through a utility and environmental services department, but the city council is the only elected governing structure for it, not completely sure though.

**Tracy Hemmeter (SCVWD):** **Given that we're trying to bring in water and energy people, great to give consideration to the local government being the cities and counties, and utilities being special districts or investor operated utilities. For example San Jose has municipal water, wastewater. It would be unfortunate to have three slots for them.**

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** ABAG wouldn't do that – they'd only get 1.

**Tracy Hemmeter (SCVWD):** Right, **utility spots get saved for special districts, investor owned utilities and reasonable representations.**

**Michael Ambrose (EBMUD):** We want diversity, cities, utilities, geographic distribution. But size is important too. Talking about resilience larger agencies like mine have done a lot like my agency need to reach out to the smaller ones that may not have the resources.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** League of mayors have a conference, league of cities has a conference. Is there a water / flood control directors conference? We could say water utilities, you get 3 spots, you make it up. You tell us who you want on the board. Does that make sense?

**Mark Boucher (Contra Costa Flood Dist):** I'm involved in BAIRWMP, another going on in the East Counties, there's BAFPA, BACWA, BAWAC; mostly GMs and staff. We don't have authority over one another.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** But you could say we're going to send John Smith to represent flood control.

**Mark Boucher (Contra Costa Flood Dist):** Yes, at the last BAFPA meeting, I sent around this graphic and said ABAG's going to want you to choose someone to sit on this. Don't know if the other utilities have something like this too.

**Lori Wyatt (SCWA):** Our board is also county board of supervisors and special district, two hats. From a county perspective, wouldn't want them to be sole reps with one seat for water/wastewater/flood and their county; too big of a pie to have one seat.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Of course. Layer one, city reps, then county reps. Next, San Mateo county puts a board supervisor there. Maybe Sonoma County gets a water person. This would give us the geographic and demographic representation. This is getting very complex, maybe too much for us to resolve. ABAG staff can review.

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** We've discussed this a lot, how seats are chosen. Peer to peer entities will be the right ones to approach. PG&E is simple, but potable water is the most complex system in the region with the most stakeholders in the region. We'll have conversation with water and flood districts to see if there's a way for self-elections through existing peer-to-peer networks. ABAG can determine city and county representation through RPC and Executive Board, but we'll have to talk to utilities. Santa Clara Valley could represent potable or flood. That could be a sidebar conversation with the utilities.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** We'll skip over a couple agenda items we've already gone over. Encourage everyone to join in at the December Regional Planning Committee. They are at 1pm the first Thursday of the month. You're experts and we'll want to hear from you – you can better articulate some of this. Also, please join on November 10<sup>th</sup> event.

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** Announced November 10<sup>th</sup> Confluence event, panels 1-5pm. Some great keynotes. Emmy award winning journalists, folks sitting on national boards. Afterwards a reception and discussion where utilities and cities can connect. We're relying on internal networks and this subcommittee to get the word out. It's about exporting ideas from this process to get other perspectives. More info online at ABAG's website.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Getting back to Next Steps on the agenda. December 7<sup>th</sup> is the next RPC meeting. Staff will refine and edit before then. Then meet again or written comments? Not getting together Nov 10 – Dec 7. Staff will gather comments for RPC. Feel free to comment. Anything else to add?

**Mark Boucher (Contra Costa Flood):** Just saw the sponsorship flyer.

**Michael Germeraad (ABAG):** The packet has a form. Also, we'd be happy to talk one on one. And if there are upcoming meetings, we can go and give presentations to get feedback.

**Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa):** Meeting adjourned.

## **Meeting Presentations**